

## Opposed to a Salaried Ministry.

Bro. J. A. Ridenour, of Ohio, offers to lift me from the mire to solid ground: very good brother, but it would be well first to see if the sandals, that trail the dust, on my brother's feet be on good *terra firma*. Whilst I admit that I am, perhaps, not altogether free from ruts, yet I believe my brother a companion.

In the first place I do not claim to have come out from the "mother" church, I never have been a member of any church, but the one whose allegiance I now claim. Bro. Bashor came through here in the spring of 1884. He preached at Tom's Brook, in the U. B. Church, for several days.

In many of his sermons, I was a hearer, and this, to the best of my knowledge, is what I heard: We as a church, believe in a supported ministry, but not a salaried one, which gives a minister \$500 a year, and another church over across the way, offers this minister \$800 or \$1000, and the minister leaves the \$500 for the \$800 or \$1000 charge. This I thought good scriptural logic; this plank I expected to find in the Brethren pulpit. Would our Bro. leave a \$500 charge for an \$800 or \$1000 one? If so, he, I fear, would be after the money instead of the souls. Does our Bro. claim to be a follower of the Lord Jesus Christ! and has he read the life of our Saviour! If so, will he tell me when Christ in all his life ever took a salary from the people? But here the Bro. does not see the difference between a supported ministry and a salaried one. Now I think he would give a sarcastic smile if his congregation were to tear down the word "Salaried" from his church door, and substitute in place "Supported." Would he make "Support" synonymous with "Salary" here?

Our Bro. says he does not know of any rut that has done more to impede the progress of the Mother Church than her opposition to a salaried ministry.

Did our Bro. or did any one leave the G. B's and take a seat in the Progressive Chariot, because of a non-salaried ministry? If so, that poor soul loves the root-of-all-evil, as much as the lay-member, who does not contribute a dollar to the support of the ministry. I thought, and I know, that the church here in this part of Va., split on the dress question. And this we claimed and now claim as "impeding" the progress of that church.

Our Bro. says that Sam. Jones is a salaried ministry man. He ought to read more of him. I never have heard of him receiving a salary. Have the people forgotten, that a few years ago, Jones would not have money that was earnestly requested for him to accept, and now he accepts what the people give him when the plates are passed around. And this is so much in excess of his wants, that he uses the surplus to start saloon keepers in some other business, and not only in this way, but in various ways he uses his money for good. Besides this, of all Jones' sermons I have read, I have never heard him say as much about "filthy lucre," as in one quarterly collection sermon of the average salaried ministry man. I have heard a number of salaried ministry sermons, and the majority of them seemed to consider the salary one of the longest hairs of their heads, and I have been to communion services, where the minister selected a text suitable to the payment of his salary, and after the members partook of communion, he gave them a lecture on money, until the members had about lost all the sacredness of the hour before, and it would seem as though they were now asked to pay for what they got. And I have known members to stay away from communion services, seemingly on this account. A moneyed sermon of this kind destroys much of the spirituality in the members.

I hope Bro. Ridenour does not think the amount of money received by the minister, is the standard by which he measures the number of souls converted!

Jones is not the man of high culture; he is simple and plain, and has been known as the "uneducated minister."

He does not wear a "plug" hat nor even cuffs for his sleeves, and does not look to his own self or to any person for his success, but, I believe him a God-fearing and Holy Ghost man.

I think Bro. Ridenour must not have read all the article upon which he uses his criticisms.

I stated that it is unjust that a minister who is not *regularly* employed in divine service, should sit in his easy chair six days out of seven in better clothes, than some of his own poor members and hearers can have on Sunday.

Of course a minister who is regularly preaching, should be well provided for, he and his family. But one who sits and waits for his seventh and even fourteenth day, and does nothing other days, while his poor members and hearers are scorching their hands and faces brown; is as unbecoming as to ask God to provide for you while you sit still and do nothing. And then, too, because he is a minister, is no reason that his large children should be entirely educated and kept at the expense of the church.

I would consider a child of mine as worthless as a dead plant, if it did not use its hands to bring forth some fruits for the body.

Does not the little birds, the plants, the trees, the animals, the insects, the fishes and all of God's hand-work, work for themselves or for others! And why should man, the noblest of all his creation, be the most worthless.

I would like if our Bro. would show one instance where Christ or his disciples ever took a salary of the people. He, I think, knows that the word "Salary" as used in the churches of to day, means a fixed compensation, for a period of time, to supply the wants of minister and family, while "Support" means help to keep the minister and family.

I believe that Christ and the disciples while journeying about usually lived of the people, but on both occasions when Christ fed the multitudes the disciples had their own bread and fishes, with them.

Here are some scriptural quotations which I would like if our Bro. would harmonize with his salary: "I have coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel. Yea, ye yourselves know, that these hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me." Acts XX: 33, 34. "For ye remember brethren, our labour and travail: for labouring night and day, because we would not be chargeable unto any of you, we preached unto you the gospel of God." Thess. 11: 7. "Neither did we eat any man's bread for naught; but wrought with labour and travail night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you: not because we have not the power, but to make ourselves an ensample unto you to follow us." Thess. 11: 8, 9. "Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind." 1 Pet. 5: 2.

Paul in his letter to the Corinthians, speaking of others not doing manual labor, says, "If others be partakers of this power over you, are not we rather? Nevertheless we have not used this power; but suffer all things, least we should hinder the gospel of Christ. Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel. But I have used none of these things; neither have I written these things, that it should be so done unto me: for it were better for me to die, than any man should make my glory void." 9: 12, 14, 15.

Now since we can not read where Christ or his apostles ever received a salary, should we give and order it to brethren of today: I do not object to a brother receiving as much as the people see proper to give him, and if that be \$25,000 a year. It would show that man to be an unusual good preacher, with plenty and good hearers.

When you advocate a salaried ministry, you are apt to preach where the salary is the largest, and your heart will apt to be after that large sum of money regardless of the good accomplished on a charge of less salary. You will doubtless find a minister of this kind, after the same thing that he accuses his members of having too earnest a desire.

A "Starved ministry whose families go half-fed and half-clad." Well Bro. Ridenour has been among the "Starved," "Half-fed," "Half-clad" ministers, more than I have, for of all the ministers, that I know, none have ever been in want one-tenth as bad as some of our poor brethren and friends.

"Whose children go uneducated;" dear Bro., I know of salaried ministers whose children go off to boarding school and have a sky-larking time, expenses paid by the church, and an overwhelming majority of whose children could no more go to a boarding schools at their own expense than a fish could live in the air. I know that some persons who are wealthy do not give as much as they ought to, perhaps; but if we had labored as hard and economized as much as they, we, too, perhaps, would not feel like giving it away in so large amounts.

You claim, too, that you have no use in the gospel alone church for a congregation that will not do what it can to support a minister.

Dear brother, do you really believe this gospel alone? Are you not swallowing a page or two more than the gospel when you emphatically denounce all who do not believe your views on this point?

The G. B's the "mother" of a non-salaried ministry, so says our brother. I believe Christ the Father and perhaps, the G. B's may bet he "Mother," if so, then we should not despise and reject her good qualities, simply because she is old and decrepid and has blundered.

We should accept her good admonition and reject the bad. Some may think we the mother and they—the G. B's—the child; well turn the picture and you have the same.

Because the child is crippled and sickly is no excuse that we should condemn and disown its good qualities, no, we should accept them and denounce the errors.

I do not want to be what is known, in the political arena, as a "Kicker," but I do not believe in hiring to preach. Yet I believe a man who gives his time to the service of God, should be supplied with the necessities of life, whether that be called salary or not.

I have a warm brotherly love for Bro. Ridenour if I do not believe exactly as he does.

G. A. COPP.

Fisher's Hill, Va.

Brethern Church, Meyersdale, Pa.

The Brethern church, of Meyersdale, was organized in February, 1881, under the eldership of H. R. Holsinger. In the beginning of the year, 1881, four brethren, then members of the German Baptist church, opened a sabbath-school in Hartley's Hall. Here they met for a few times only, then removed to Lincon's Hall, when on the 8th of January an organization was effected with 29 scholars and 4 teachers.

The troubles in the G. B. church, which resulted in a division of what is known as the Conservatives and the Progressives or the German Baptists and the Brethren, may be said, in general, to have led to the organization of this school. On the 18th of January, 1881, these four brethren were disfellowshipped by the G. B. church, for refusing to close said school. In February of the same year, they called Rev. H. R. Holsinger, who then resided at Berlin, to organize them into a congregation. Meanwhile 23 members withdrew from the jurisdiction of G. B. rule—which together with 4, made 27 members at the date of organization. Brother Holsinger preached for this congregation in the Hall, for about one month, when Rev. A. D. Gnagey, the present pastor, took charge of the congregation.

On March 13th, 1881, Rev. Gnagey preached his first sermon for the Brethren in the Lutheran church. The house in which the congregation now worships was erected in the summer of 1881, at a cost of about \$3,000. The school and church moved in the new house Nov. 6th, '81. The S. S. organized with 29 scholars and 4 teachers, now numbers 125 scholars with 14 teachers. Virtually, the church with 4 members and has grown to 105, though at present the membership numbers only 85. A number have been dismissed by certificate, and a few have withdrawn from the congregation. The expenses of the church in 1885 were about \$1,000.—*Meyersdale Commercial*.

That cunning may succeed for the time being is perhaps true; that it will fail in the end is equally true.

We are no longer masters of ourselves, but the time of a distempered imagination.